

devices have some variability in measuring. No device is perfect, providing a 100% accurate measurement each and every time it is used and this fact is understood by the person of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, as a practical context, any such claim limitation that does not use words of relativity implicitly include them anyway. The explicit inclusion of such words does not alter the interpretation of the claim to the person of ordinary skill in the art.

With respect to claim 50, it is not seen where the references describe an anisotropic MFM scan. The rejection does not appear to address this limitation and it is not seen why such a property would be inherent in the prior art.

With regard to claim 51, the claim clearly describes a product by process where the starting copper composition was not magnetic, yet the product is magnetic. The prior art does not teach the process nor does it teach the use of the process to impart magnetic properties on a copper composition. Finally, the prior art does not teach a magnetic product which differs from its non-magnetic starting material by the additional property of having substantially similar Gauss readings, taken in the context of the magnetic properties imparted on the product. While the specification may not provide a brightline test for assessing the Gauss readings and small differences in readings are certainly provided for (indeed any measuring device will provide some deviation in measurement), the prior art products would not be expected to have a substantially similar Gauss reading of any non-magnetic copper starting material that may be used to create the alloy described.

With regard to claims 52 and 54, as in claim 51, the references do not teach products which decouple Gauss readings and magnetic properties. When read in light of the specification and the person of ordinary skill in the art, while the composition may literally have a small Gauss reading, the magnetic compositions of the references would not be expected to possess a small Gauss reading.

With regard to claims 53 and 54, the Examiner has not shown or provided any reasons as to why the copper compositions would be expected to have the properties of the claims.

While it is appreciated that claims 50-54 do not recite the degree of purity as claimed in claim 44, for example, Applicants are still entitled to claim magnetic copper which contains impurities.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (978) 251-3509.

Respectfully submitted,

ELMORE PATENT LAW GROUP, P.C.

/Carolyn S. Elmore/

By _____

Carolyn S. Elmore

Registration No.: 37,567

Telephone: (978) 251-3509

Facsimile: (978) 251-3973

Westford, MA 01886

Dated: October 17, 2008